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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Hayley Henderson,

Editor
BMC Nephrology

Please find below our responses to the verbatim comments on our manuscript (BNEP-D-17-00687R1) entitled “Multidimensional Pruritus Assessment in Hemodialysis Patients”. We would like to sincerely thank you and the two reviewers for their careful review of the manuscript and for providing comments to strengthen its quality. We have made appropriate text modifications, which are detailed point-by-point below and are indicated with red in the manuscript. We have found these suggestions extremely helpful and believe the modifications have greatly strengthened this manuscript.

Thank you again for considering this revised and resubmitted manuscript.

Kind regards,

Nese Altnok Ersoy, PhD (c), RN
Corresponding Author
Reviewer Comments  Author Responses

Editorial Comment

Please copy-edit your manuscript. We suggest you ask a native English-speaking colleague to help you with this, or to employ a professional service. Thanks for comment. We submitted the manuscript to a company (Editage) for extensive English Editing service. The certificate of advanced editing is attached.

Reviewer #1

1) The English should be improved, as well as readability of the manuscript.

Thanks for comment. We submitted the manuscript to a company (Editage) for extensive English Editing service. The certificate of advanced editing is attached.

2) Communication of the results is not optimal.

Tables are edited in terms of simplification and readability as well as statistical analysis presentation. Figures are also edited. Statistical analysis added to the figures, and the title of the figures clarified.

3) Hemodialysis quality - I suggest to use the term adequacy, or simply Kt/V.

Changed as requested.

4) Please clarify "speed was 620 ± 150 ml/dk".

Corrected.

5) Page four, the first line: speed - please clarify the meaning

Explanation added.

6) Ref No 12 should be cited precisely and translated in English, in addition to the original

Corrected as requested.

7) Ref 34: please cite precisely, including ISBN

Corrected as requested.

8) The figures should be self-explanatory and consistent

Figures edited as requested.
9) The tables should be self-explanatory including statistics.

Tables edited as requested.

10) The Table one should be reduced, or divided to 2 tables, and more readable. The decimals should in be reduced, to improve readability.

Tables edited and reshaped as requested. The Table one divided to 2 tables (titled as Table 1a. and Table 1b.). The decimals reduced as requested.

Reviewer #2 (Specific Comments)

1) What is the dialysis vintage in terms of months with SD

The mean dialysis vintage added in the result section “sample characteristics”. The mean vintage is 12.2 ± 6.5 years (146.4 ± 78 months).

2) Were the patients on antihistaminic/ other medication for pruritus and if so it is important to mention which ones

Patients under pharmacological treatment for pruritus were not approached for the study. So they weren’t receiving any medication.

3) Was any association noted with regard to diabetic status, Hepatitis status, liver disease since these are important factors.

Patients with liver diseases (e.g. hepatitis) were not approached for the study.

27% of patients had diabetes mellitus. There is no association determined between the comorbidity of diabetes mellitus and pruritus. This sentence is added to results section.

4) It is unclear what the multidimensional approach that is mentioned by the authors is ...? further details will need to be added.

Multidimensional approach is explained in background section.

5) Extensive English language editing is necessary

Thanks for comment. We submitted the manuscript to a company (Editage) for extensive English Editing service. The certificate of advanced editing is attached.

6) The presentation is haphazard and needs to be streamlined. The study has several drawbacks which are highlighted by the authors while the take away message from the study needs to be highlighted.

The manuscript re-read, re-edited. The presentation tried to be streamlined.